#### Memorandum

Date:

January 20, 2010

To:

Assistant Commissioner, Field

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Protective Services Division

File No.:

020.9261.A04629.012mm.doc

Subject:

QUARTERLY COMMAND INSPECTION

Protective Services Division (PSD) has completed its quarterly Command Inspection on Chapter 6, Command Grants Management and Command Overtime. PSD has no Grant Program management responsibilities and due to budget constraints, no overtime is approved for the Division non-uniformed staff. PSD has provided comments in the Remarks section for the "Not Applicable" items.

If you have any questions or need further clarification, please contact Assistant Chief Pat Burnett or me at (916) 323-1514.

M. J. NIVENS, Chief for

Attachments

1 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command:	Division: Protective Services Division	Number: 020
Evaluated by: Judy Sharff		Date: 01/19/2010
Assisted by:		Date:

applica discrep Further	ble legal statues, or deficien ancies and/or deficiencies s more, the Exceptions Docur	al items with "Yes" or "No" answers icies noted in the inspections shall hall be documented on an Excepti ment shall include any follow-up ar on" box shall be marked and only c	be commer ons Docum nd/or correc	nted on via thent and addition and the time and addition addition (s)	ne "Remark ressed to th ) taken. If t	s" section. A ne next level of his form is us	dditionally, such of command.
	T INODESTICAL		Lead Inspe	ector's Signatu	ıre:		
	FINSPECTION				0 /	- /·	
Div	ision Level	☐ Command Level	tu	dy	Shery	4	
☐ Exe	ecutive Office Level	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	10	0			
Fo	llow-up Required:			er's Signature	:		Date:
	] Yes 🔲 No	Follow-up Inspection	W	Mc=	FOR		01-19-10
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6							
Note:		necked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	tilized for ex	xplanation		
1.	a grant application to a t Office of Traffic Safety (	s proposing or has submitted funding agency other than the OTS) that appears to focus early within the jurisdiction of commander notify the	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	any Grant	PSD does not have Program ent responsibilities
2.	Has OTS grant funding, Plan, been sought for tra for the purpose of condu	through the Highway Safety affic safety-related activities acting inventories, need and tem development or program	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	have any (	PSD does not Grant Program ent responsibilities
3.		ht grant funding to assist with d with the priority programs I Highway Traffic Safety	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	have any (	PSD does not Grant Program ent responsibilities
4.		sured grant funds are not I other programs or used for me expenditures?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A		PSD does not Grant Program lities
	Unit (GMU)?	nels to Grants Management	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	have any ( manageme	PSD does not Grant Program ent responsibilities
6.	Was GMU contacted to opersonnel billing rates us preparing concept paper	sed for grant projects when	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	have any (	PSD does not Grant Program ent responsibilities

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

				-	
7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
	. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
11	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
12	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
13	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
14	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
15	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?  This would include any of the following:  • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the	☐ Yes	□No	<b>⊠</b> .N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	<ul><li>Governor.</li><li>Applications for federal funds which exceed</li></ul>				
L	the amount specified in the budget.				
18.	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
19.	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
20.	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD does not have any Grant Program management responsibilities
	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
İ	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division: PSD	Chapter: Ch. 6
Inspected by: Judy Sharff	···	Date: 01/19/2010

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co	Inspecti docume	on number.  Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to do	vard to:" enter the ne cument innovative p	
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☑ Division Level ☐ Command I ☐ Executive Office Level	Division Level			☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:  Yes No  Chapter Inspection:		rd to: AC, Field ate: 01/20/2010		
Inspector's Comments Regar None  Command Suggestions for Some			S:	
Inspector's Findings: Protective Services Division do	oes no	t have any Grant F	rogram manag	jement responsibilities.
				cur shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall a	address	non concurrence by o	ommander (e.g., f	findings revised, findings unchanged,

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division: PSD	Chapter: Ch. 6
Inspected by: Judy Sharff		Date: 01/19/2010

· [1] 在19 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	
Required Action: None	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	01/19/10
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	INCOPPORTORIO CIONATURE	5 IS(*/S
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	1/20/2010
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
employee  Concur  Do not concur	4. R. Burnell A/chief	1/20/10

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command:	Division: Protective Services Division	Number: 020
Evaluated by: Judy Sha	Date: 01/19/2010	
Assisted by:		Date:

applica discrep Further	ble legal statues, or deficienci ancies and/or deficiencies sha more, the Exceptions Documa	items with "Yes" or "No" answers les noted in the inspections shall all be documented on an Excepti ent shall include any follow-up ar " box shall be marked and only c	be commer ons Docum id/or correc	nted on via ti ent and add tive action(s	he "Remark ressed to th ) taken.  If t	s" section. A ne next level on his form is us	dditionally, such of command.
9====							
TYPE O	F INSPECTION			ector's Signati			
⊠ Divi	ision Level	Command Level	a	dy S	harff	/	
☐ Exe	ecutive Office Level [	Voluntary Self-Inspection	Jones	1	<i></i>		
Fo	llow-up Required:	☐ Follow-up Inspection	Command	er's <b>S</b> ignature	50.4		Date:
	Yes 🛛 No		CON	100	tour		
HPM 4	pplicable policies, refer to 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and er 2, and HPM 10.3, Cha						
		ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for e	xplanation		
1.	Is the hiring company/age overtime being held responding minimum of four hours of uniformed employee, regaservice/detail?	onsible for paying a overtime per CHP	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A		
<ol> <li>Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation?</li> </ol>				□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
3.	Are reimbursable special for all overtime associated projects?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		
Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects?				☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
5.	Is the commander ensuring overtime is not being claim than Bargaining Unit 7, when the commander ensuring that the commander ensuring the	inder ensuring non-reimbursable of being claimed for an employee, other ng Unit 7, while on vacation or it time off for hours worked during their			⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
6.	Is "RDO" being written in t	the "Notes" section of the ord, for overtime worked on	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Management CHP 415s.	ne Executive staff does not utilize
7.	Is there a CHP 90, Report	of Court Appearance -				Remarks:	

2 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

	Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant when overtime is associated for civil court?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	
8.	Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Executive Management staff does not utilize CHP 415s.
9.	Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Executive Management staff does not utilize CHP 415s.
	Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
11.	If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: PSD has not encountered the need for a peer support counselor.
12.	Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Executive Management staff does not utilize CHP 415s.
13.	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Executive Management staff does not incur compensated time off hours.
14.	Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Executive Management staff does not incur compensated time off hours.
15.	Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
16.	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division: PSD	Chapter: Ch. 6	
Inspected by: Judy Sharff		Date: 01/19/2010	

Page 1 of 2

		ACCESS AND	
number of the inspection in the Chapter	Inspecti	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or on number. Under "Forward to:" enter the nent shall be utilized to document innovative	fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter
improvement, identified deficiencies, con	rective a	action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may	be used if additional space is required.
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☑ Division Level ☐ Command Level		Total hours expended on the inspection: 1	Corrective Action Plan Included
☐ Executive Office Level			Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to: AC, Field	
☐ Yes	Due D	ate: 01/20/2010	
Chapter Inspection:			
Inspector's Comments Regar	ding Ir	anovative Practices:	· 11、26、10、10、10、10、10、10、10、10、10、10、10、10、10、
None	unig n	movative i factices.	
Command Suggestions for St	tatewic	de Improvement	
None	latevic	ie improvement.	
Inspector's Findings:			
			f, Assistant Chief, Lieutenant, Staff
•		•	II. The PSD Command staff does
not incur paid overtime or com for overtime due to budget con			embers of PSD are not approved
Commander's Response: ⊠	Concu	ır or □ Do Not Concur (Do Not Co	ncur shall document basis for response)

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division: PSD	Chapter: Ch. 6
Inspected by: Judy Sharff		Date: 01/19/2010

Mark with the same transfer to the	A -300 ST 0 ST 1 (1/10) (1/10)	7 Table 1 St. 1 Table	S to a visit of the case	
Required Action: None				
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline				

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	01-19-10
	Judy Sharf	1/20/2010
☐ Reviewer discussed this report with employee ☐ Do not concur	P. R. Burnell Alchif	1/20/10

#### Memorandum

Date:

December 4, 2009

To:

Protective Services Division

From:

**DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL** 

**Judicial Protection Section** 

File No.:

021.11545

Subject:

QUARTERLY COMMAND INSPECTION

Judicial Protection Section (JPS) has completed its inspection of Chapter 6, Command Grant Management and Command Overtime. There were no discrepancies, and comments were noted in the Remarks section for Not Applicable events.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (415) 865-7900.

L. MOBLEY, Lieutenant

Commander

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

#### EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 1 of 2

Command: JPS	Division:	Chapter: Chapter 6
Inspected by:		Date: 12/04/2009
Sergeant A. Ching, #14984		12/04/2009

number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This	Inspection docume	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or on number. Under "Forward to:" enter the neent shall be utilized to document innovative paction plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be	ractices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command L ☐ Executive Office Level	evel	Total hours expended on the inspection: 4 hours	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:  ☐ Yes ⊠ No	Forwa		
Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regard None.  Command Suggestions for St None.			
Inspector's Findings: None.			
Commander's Response: ⊠	Concu	r or   Do Not Concur (Do Not Con	cur shall document basis for response)

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: JPS	Division:	Chapter: Chapter 6
Inspected by: Sergeant A. C		Date: 12/04/2009

	The Switzer of the Switzer				_
Required Action				22/A	
Corrective Action Pla	an/Timeline				
None.	Only of the passing that revenue at come.				

	7	
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/04/2009
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/04/2009
⊠ Reviewer discussed this report with employee     ⊠ Concur    □ Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/04/2009

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command:	Division:	Number:
JPS	PSD	021
Evaluated by: Sergeant A. Ching,#14984		Date: 12/01/2009
Assisted by:		Date:
Sergeant M. Serrano,#10777		12/01/09

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.						
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Insp	ector's Signatu	ıre:			
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level	-			>		
Executive Office Level				/		
Follow-up Required:	Command	ler's Şignature	1.0	Date: 12/03/2009		
Yes No		to to	WA			
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6						
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for ex	planation			
<ol> <li>If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?						
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Judicial Protection Section is a reimbursable contact to provide police protective services to the State of California Supreme and Appellate Courts of Appeal. Any additional funding is the sole responsibility of the Courts. This response applies to all the following N/A's.		
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		
4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		
<ol><li>Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management</li></ol>	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:		

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
<ul> <li>17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?  This would include any of the following:  <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
the amount specified in the budget.				

3 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
ĺ	Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Manageme	nt Unit	A STATE OF THE STA		
	23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
_	25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	26. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between				

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

#### Inspected by: Sergeant A. Ching, #14984

**JPS** 

Command:

Division:

PSD

Chapter:	
Chapter 6	
Date:	
12/04/2009	

Page 1 of 2

	Inspection docume	on number. Under "Forwa ent shall be utilized to doci	ard to:" enter the nexument innovative pra			
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection: 4 hours		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included		
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ☑ No	rd to: ate:					
Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: None.						
Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: None.						
Inspector's Findings: None.						
Commander's Response: ⊠ Concur or ☐ Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)						

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: Division:		Chapter:
JPS	PSD	Chapter 6
Inspected by:		Date:
Sergeant A. Ching, #14984		12/04/2009

A TOWN OF THE STATE OF THE			STATE OF THE STATE
Required Action			
Corrective Action Plan/Tir	meline		
None.			

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/04/2009
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/04/2009
□ Reviewer discussed this report with employee     □ Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/04/2009

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Overtime

Command:	Division;	Number:
JPS	PSD	021
Evaluated by: Sergeant A. Ching, #14984		Date: 12/01/2009
Assisted by:	Date:	
Maria Calalo, #	12/01/2009	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Commander's Signature: Date: Follow-up Required: 12/04/2009 ☐ Follow-up Inspection Yes  $\bowtie$  No For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6, HPM 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, Chapter 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable Remarks: overtime being held responsible for paying a ✓ Yes □ No □ N/A minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail? Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated Remarks: The 24 hours cancellation to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation □ No □ N/A ✓ Yes pertains to only COZEEP/MAZEEP notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the overtime offered from other Area scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed offices. employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation? 3. Are reimbursable special project codes being used Remarks: for all overtime associated with reimbursable special □ No □ N/A projects? 4. Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel Remarks: overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of ⊠ Yes ☐ No □ N/A Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects? 5. Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable Remarks: No Bargaining Unit 7 overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other ⊠ N/A Yes □ No employees assigned to JPS. than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during their regular work shift time? 6. Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the Remarks: CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked on X Yes ☐ No □ N/A a regular day off? 7. Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance -Remarks: Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant ⊠ Yes □No □ N/A when overtime is associated for civil court?

Page 2 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8	Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9	Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	<ol> <li>Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	I. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	2. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15	i. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17	. Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

#### Memorandum

Date:

December 10, 2009

To:

Office of Inspections

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Dignitary Protection Section

File No.:

023.13231.12912

Subject:

FOURTH QUARTER COMMAND INSPECTION

Dignitary Protection Section (DPS), has completed its fourth quarter 2009 Command Inspection on chapter six of HPM 22.1, Command Inspections Program Manual. The inspection included all four DPS sections (023, 024, 026 and 027).

If you should have any questions regarding this request please contact Lieutenant Andy Menard at (916) 324-6501.

R.J. OKASHIMA, Captain

Commander

1 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command:	Division:	Number:
Dignitary	Protective	000
Protection	Services	023
Section	Division	
Evaluated by:	·	Date:
Andy Menard		11/18/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE	OF INSPECTION		Lead Insp	ector's Signat	ure:		
☐ Di	vision Level	⊠ Command Level			01		
☐ Ex	ecutive Office Level [	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	(-	JEN.	1-1		
F	ollow-up Required:		Command	er's Signature	i		Date:
		Follow-up Inspection	1	01			l
	🗌 Yes 🛛 No		/him	1 Sku	Kunn		11/30/09
For a	pplicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 6,	/				
HPM	40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and	d 10, HPM 10.5,	/				ii)
Chap	ter 2, and HPM 10.3, Cha	apters 24 and 28.					
Note:	If a "No" or "N/A" box is che	ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanatior	1.	
1.	Is the hiring company/age overtime being held response.	ency for reimbursable	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	minimum of four hours of	overtime per CHP	M res	□ 140	I III IN/A		
	uniformed employee, rega						
	service/detail?						
2.	Is a minimum of four hour	s overtime being allocated					
	to each CHP uniformed e	mployee(s) if cancellation		☐ No		Remarks:	
	notification is made 24 ho						
	scheduled detail and the	assigned CHP uniformed obtified of such cancellation?					
3.							
0.		d with reimbursable special	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	projects?	a with reministrative operation					
4.	Is the commander ensuring	ng nonuniformed personnel					
	overtime hours are not ref	flected on the Report of		☐ No		Remarks:	
-	Overtime Hours for Reimb	oursable Special Projects?					
5.		ig non-reimbursable	N V	□ Na	□ N//A	Remarks:	
	than Bargaining Unit 7, wh	ned for an employee, other	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A		
	compensated time off for						
	regular work shift time?	riouro morniou during aron					
6.	Is "RDO" being written in t						
	CHP 415, Daly Field Reco	ord, for overtime worked on		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	a regular day off?						
7.	Is there a CHP 90, Report	of Court Appearance -			N NI	Remarks: D	PS has not had the
	Civil Action, completed for when overtime is associated		☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A		e to complete a CHP 90.
	when overtime is associate	ed for civil coult?					

2 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8. Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: DPS has not incurred any overtime by a peer support counselor.
12. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:
Dignitary	Protective	000
Protection	Services	023
Section	Division	
Evaluated by:		Date:
Andy Menard		11/18/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE C	OF INSPECTION		Lead Insp	ector's Signat	ure:		
Div	vision Level	☐ Command Level			01	1	
-				All		/	
	ecutive Office Level	Voluntary Self-Inspection	1	-99	-	<u> </u>	l D-t
F	ollow-up Required:		Command	er's Signature	<b>)</b> :		Date:
_		Follow-up Inspection		121		•	1 1
	] Yes ⊠ No		//nn	r Ma	Mun		11/30/09
For a	oplicable policy, refer to:	GO 40.6					
	If a "No" or "N/A" box is ched		shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation		
1,	If the commander became agency or organization is pagent application to a fun Office of Traffic Safety (OT on traffic safety goals clear the Department, did the coappropriate assistant command.	proposing or has submitted ding agency other than the S) that appears to focus rly within the jurisdiction of mmander notify the	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A		The Grant program specifically fall under n of DPS.
	Has OTS grant funding, this Plan, been sought for traffiction for the purpose of conduction engineering studies, system implementations?	rough the Highway Safety c safety-related activities ng inventories, need and n development or program	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A		The Grant program pecifically fall under n of DPS.
3.	Has the command sought of the expenses associated widentified by the National H Administration?	rith the priority programs	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A		The Grant program pecifically fall under n of DPS.
	Has the commander ensure being reallocated to fund of non-reimbursable overtime	ther programs or used for expenditures?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A		The Grant program pecifically fall under n of DPS.
	Are concept papers regard submitted through channels Unit (GMU)?	s to Grants Management	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s the mission	
6.	Was GMU contacted to det personnel billing rates used preparing concept paper but	for grant projects when	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A		The Grant program pecifically fall under n of DPS.

Page 2 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

**Command Grant Management** 

7.	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
8.	revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

	<ul> <li>7. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?         <ul> <li>This would include any of the following:</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	8. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	9. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	). Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
21	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS.
Quest	ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
	. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page	1	of	2
------	---	----	---

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Dignitary	Protective	Chapter 6
Protection	Services	
Section	Division	

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required.						
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended inspection:  1 hour	d on the	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included		
Follow-up Required: Forward to:						
☐ Yes	Due D	ate:				
Chapter Inspection: Chapter	6					
Inspector's Comments Regar	ding Ir	novative Practices		STATES OF A STATE OF STATES		
None.						
Command Suggestions for S	tatewid	e Improvement:				
None.						
Inspector's Findings:						
The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission Dignitary Protection Section (DPS). The overtime program within DPS conforms with Departmental Policy.						
Commander's Response:  Concur or  Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)						

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: Division: Chapter:
Dignitary Protective Chapter 6
Protection Services
Section Division

Inspector's Comments: etc.)	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
Required Action: None.	
Corrective Action Plan/T	imeline

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 11/30/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	11/19/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
☑ Concur ☐ Do not concur	Y. N. Durnell A/Chaf	1/20/10

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Dignitary Protection Section – South	Division: Protective Services Division	Number: 024
Evaluated by: Andy Menard		Date: 11/18/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Commander's Signature. Follow-up Required: ☐ Follow-up Inspection 11/30/09 Yes  $\boxtimes$  No For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. If the commander became aware that another Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under agency or organization is proposing or has submitted ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A the mission of DPS - South. a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Remarks: The Grant program Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ☐ Yes □No  $\square$  N/A does not specifically fall under for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and the mission of DPS - South. engineering studies, system development or program implementations? 3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with Remarks: The Grant program the expenses associated with the priority programs ☐ Yes □ No  $\bowtie$  N/A does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South. identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? Has the commander ensured grant funds are not Remarks: The Grant program being reallocated to fund other programs or used for ☐ Yes □No ⊠ N/A does not specifically fall under non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? the mission of DPS - South. Are concept papers regarding grant funding Remarks: The Grant program submitted through channels to Grants Management ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South. Unit (GMU)? Was GMU contacted to determine the current Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under personnel billing rates used for grant projects when ☐ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A the mission of DPS - South. preparing concept paper budgets?

2 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7.	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
8.	revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
					ö

3 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

17	<ul> <li>Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?</li> <li>This would include any of the following:         <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□ No	N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
	. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
_	. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of DPS - South.
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit		E EN IN	
	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

1 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command:	Division:	Number;
Dignitary	Protective	
Protection	Services	024
Section - South	Division	
Evaluated by:		Date:
Andy Menard		11/18/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION				Lead Inspector's Signature:				
☐ Div	vision Level	☑ Command Level	$\sim \alpha / 1$					
ПЕх	ecutive Office Level	Voluntary Self-Inspection	(A)					
	ollow-up Required:	* 1	Commander's Signature: Date:				Date:	
1		Follow-up Inspection	Man Charlina 11/20/00				, ,	
	Yes No		140	a Ida	unteres	v	11/20/09	
For a	pplicable policies, refer to	HPM 11.1, Chapter 6,	/	-				
	40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and		6					
Chap	ter 2, and HPM 10.3, Cha	pters 24 and 28.						
Note:	If a "No" or "N/A" box is ched	ked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation		DEC. POTONIA LA SOLI	
1.	Is the hiring company/age	ncy for reimbursable						
	overtime being held respon	nsible for paying a		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	minimum of four hours of o							
uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail?								
Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated						D		
to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation		⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed								
employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation?								
Are reimbursable special project codes being used						Demodes		
for all overtime associated with reimbursable special		⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
4	projects? Is the commander ensuring	nonuniformed personnel						
11	overtime hours are not refle		⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	Overtime Hours for Reimbu	ursable Special Projects?						
5.	Is the commander ensuring		N			Remarks:		
overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or		⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	T torriding.			
	compensated time off for hours worked during their							
	regular work shift time?							
6.	Is "RDO" being written in th		MV-			Remarks:		
	CHP 415, Daly Field Recor a regular day off?	u, for overtime worked on	⊠ Yes	☐ No	│			
7.	Is there a CHP 90, Report of	of Court Appearance -						
	Civil Action, completed for	each officer or sergeant	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:		
	when overtime is associate	d for civil court?						

2 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8. Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: DPS - S has not incurred any overtime by a peer support counselor.
12. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command: Division: Chapter:
Dignitary Protective Chapter 6
Protection Services
Section- South Division

Page 1 of 2			2.60	-
	Inspection of the Inspection o	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to do	vard to:" enter the new cument innovative pr	
TYPE OF INSPECTION  Division Level Command Level		Total hours expended on the inspection:		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included☐ Attachments Included
Executive Office Level		1 hour		
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:		
☐ Yes	Due D	ate:		
Chapter Inspection: Chapter	6			
Inspector's Comments Regar	ding Ir	nnovative Practices		
None.				
Command Suggestions for S	tatewic	le Improvement:		
None.				
Inspector's Findings:				
The Grant program does not sovertime program within DPS o				y Protection Section (DPS). The
Commander's Response: 🖂 Concur or 🗌 Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)				

#### **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**

#### **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Command: Division: Chapter: Chapter 6 Dignitary Protective Protection Services Section- South | Division

Page 2 of 2	
Inspector's Comments: etc.)	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
Paguirad Action: Nana	
Required Action: None.	
Corrective Action Plan/T	ïmeline
on Plan/T	imeline

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	11/20/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	11/19/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE /
☑ Concur ☐ Do not concur	4. K. Durnell A/Chuf	1/20/10

1 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:	
Governor's	Protective	000	
Protective Detail	Services	026	
– North	Division		
Evaluated by:		Date:	
Andy Menard		11/18/2009	
Assisted by:	3	Date:	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTIO	N		Lead Insp	ector's Signat	ure:		
☐ Division Level		□ Command Level		- On	) (		
☐ Executive Office	e Level	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	/_	- ACC		/	
Follow-up R	equired:		Command	er's Signature			Date:
	<u> </u>	Follow-up Inspection	1	171	//	*	11.
Yes	⊠ No		1/100	i UKU	samo	/	11/20/09
For applicable po							
Note: If a "No" or "	N/A" box is ch	necked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation		
agency or a grant app Office of To on traffic so	organization i olication to a f raffic Safety (d afety goals cle	ne aware that another s proposing or has submitted unding agency other than the OTS) that appears to focus early within the jurisdiction of commander notify the	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program specifically fall under on of GPD - North.
	assistant co						
2. Has OTS g Plan, been for the purp engineering implementa	rant funding, sought for tra lose of condu studies, systitions?	through the Highway Safety affic safety-related activities cting inventories, need and tem development or program	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program specifically fall under on of GPD - North.
the expens	es associated y the National	nt grant funding to assist with I with the priority programs I Highway Traffic Safety	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program specifically fall under on GPD - North.
being reallo non-reimbu	cated to fund rsable overting	ured grant funds are not other programs or used for ne expenditures?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s the missio	The Grant program specifically fall under on of GPD - North.
submitted tl Unit (GMU)	nrough chann ?	rding grant funding els to Grants Management	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s the missio	The Grant program specifically fall under n of GPD - North.
personnel b	contacted to could illing rates us oncept paper	letermine the current ed for grant projects when budgets?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program specifically fall under n of GPD - North.

2 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
ć C F	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
e	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the espective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

<ul> <li>17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?  This would include any of the following:  <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
20. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - North.
Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
26. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

1 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

-Command:	-Division:	Number:
Governor's	Protective	
Protective Detail	Services	026
- North	Division	
Evaluated by:	•	Date:
Andy Menard		11/18/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE (	OF INSPECTION		Lead Inspe	ector's Signat	ure:	/,	
☐ Div	vision Level	□ Command Level		M	11/		
☐ Ex	ecutive Office Level	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection		All I	1	•/	
Fo	ollow-up Required:		Command	er's Signature		,	Date:
_		Follow-up Inspection		1			1 1 1 2 2
	☐ Yes ☐ No //an Chushina 11/20/00					11/20109	
		to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6,	/				
	40.71, Chapters 2, 8, ar						
Спар	ter 2, and HPM 10.3, Ch	iapters 24 and 26.					
Note:	If a "No" or "N/A" box is ch	ecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	tilized for e	xplanation		
	Is the hiring company/ag	ency for reimbursable					•
	overtime being held resp	ponsible for paying a	☐ Yes	☐ No		Remarks:	
	minimum of four hours o uniformed employee, reg						
	service/detail?	gardiess of length of					
2.	Is a minimum of four hou	irs overtime being allocated					
		employee(s) if cancellation		☐ No	│ □ N/A	Remarks:	
	notification is made 24 h	ours or less prior to the assigned CHP uniformed					
		notified of such cancellation?					
3.		project codes being used					
	for all overtime associate	ed with reimbursable special		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
4.	projects?	ing populatormed povernal					
4.	overtime hours are not re	ing nonuniformed personnel	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
		bursable Special Projects?					
5.	Is the commander ensuri		_			Remarks:	
		med for an employee, other	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks.	
	than Bargaining Unit 7, w	hours worked during their					
	regular work shift time?	neare werked daring tren					
6.		the "Notes" section of the				Remarks:	
		ord, for overtime worked on	⊠ Yes	☐ No	∏ N/A	rtemants.	
7.	a regular day off? Is there a CHP 90, Repor	t of Court Annearance -					
, .	Civil Action, completed fo	or each officer or sergeant	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	when overtime is associa			_			

2 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Overtime

Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: GPD - N has not incurred any overtime by a peer support counselor.
12. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16. Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

#### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM **EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT**

Command: Governor's Protection Detail - North

Division: Protective Services Division

Chapter: Chapter 6

Pag	e 1	of 2	

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required.

TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Comman	Total hours expended inspection:	d on the	Corrective Action Plan Included			
☐ Executive Office Level	1 hour		Attachments Included			
Follow-up Required:	Forward to:					
☐ Yes	Due Date:					
Chapter Inspection: Chapter 6						
Inspector's Comments Regard	ling Innovative Practices	as seed as with the see				
None.						
Command Suggestions for Sta	atewide Improvement:					
None.						
Inspector's Findings:						
T. C						

The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission Governor's Protection Detail – North (GPD). The overtime program within GPD – North conforms with Departmental Policy.

Commander's Response: 
Concur or 
Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Division:	] Chapter:
Protective	Chapter 6
Services	
Division	
	Services

Inspector's Comments: etc.)	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
<b>新年的主义的</b> 对于安全的人	
Required Action: None.	
Corrective Action Plan/1	Timeline

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	11/30/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	11/19/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
☑ Concur ☐ Do not concur	f. R. Burnell A/Chief	1/20/10

1 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Governor's	Division: Protective	Number:
Protective Detail  – South	Services Division	027
Evaluated by: Andy Menard		Date: 11/18/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION				Lead Inspector's Signature:				
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level				$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$				
Follow-up Re		Voluntary Self-Inspection	Command	er's Signature			Date:	
1 onew up 1	quirou.	Follow-up Inspection	1	0	/ /		,	
☐ Yes	⊠ No		Ma	u (M	udia	ea.	11/30/09	
For applicable poli	cy, refer to:	GO 40.6						
		cked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for ex	xplanation			
agency or or a grant appli Office of Tra	ganization is cation to a fu ffic Safety (O	e aware that another proposing or has submitted nding agency other than the TS) that appears to focus arly within the jurisdiction of	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program specifically fall under n of GPD - South.	
the Departm		ommander notify the						
Has OTS gra     Plan, been s     for the purpo	ant funding, the ought for traff se of conduct studies, syste	nrough the Highway Safety fic safety-related activities ting inventories, need and em development or program	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program specifically fall under n of GPD - South.	
the expenses	s associated v the National I	grant funding to assist with with the priority programs Highway Traffic Safety	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program specifically fall under n of GPD - South.	
being realloc	ated to fund o	red grant funds are not other programs or used for expenditures?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program pecifically fall under n of GPD - South.	
		ding grant funding Is to Grants Management	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program pecifically fall under n of GPD - South.	
	ing rates use	termine the current d for grant projects when udgets?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	does not s	The Grant program pecifically fall under n of GPD - South.	

2 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**

#### INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

7.	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
8.	revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.

3 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**

#### INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

- 1					
	<ul> <li>17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?</li> <li>This would include any of the following:</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not</li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	<ul> <li>included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul>				
	18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
	22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The Grant program does not specifically fall under the mission of GPD - South.
(	Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit	AVUENUMENT		
	23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	26. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GM I2	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Overtime

Command:	Division:	Number:
Governor's	Protective	
Protective Detail	Services	027
- South	Division	
Evaluated by:		Date:
Andy Menard		11/18/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Inspector's Signature:	
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspe	ion July	
Follow-up Required:    Follow-up Inspect   Yes   No	Commander's Signature: Date:	
For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter HPM 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, Chapter 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28.		
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" se	tion shall be utilized for explanation.	
<ol> <li>Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable overtime being held responsible for paying a minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail?</li> </ol>		
<ol> <li>Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellatinotification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellated</li> </ol>	n   🗵 Yes   🗌 No   🗍 N/A   Remarks:	
<ol> <li>Are reimbursable special project codes being use for all overtime associated with reimbursable spe projects?</li> </ol>		
<ol> <li>Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed person overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Project</li> </ol>	│ ∑ Yes │	
5. Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable overtime is not being claimed for an employee, o than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during the regular work shift time?		
6. Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked a regular day off?	on Yes No N/A Remarks:	
7. Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance - Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeal when overtime is associated for civil court?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A Remarks:	

2 of 2

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

#### **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**

#### INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8. Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: GPD - S has not incurred any overtime by a peer support counselor.
12. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17. Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

# COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 1 of 2

Command: Division: Chapter:
Governor's Protective Chapter 6
Protection Services
Detail - South Division

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall to number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co	Inspection of the Inspection	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to do	ard to:" enter the nex cument innovative pr	ill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter xt level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide e used if additional space is required.	
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection:  1 hour		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included☐ Attachments Included	
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:			
☐ Yes	Due D	ate:			
Chapter Inspection: Chapter 6  Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:  None.  Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement:					
None.					
Inspector's Findings:					
The Grant program does not space (GPD). The overtime program	pecifica within	ally fall under the n GPD - South conf	nission Governo orms with Depa	or's Protection Detail – South artmental Policy.	
Commander's Response: 🖂	Commander's Response:  Concur or  Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)				

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: Governor's	Division: Protective	Chapter:
Protection	Services	
Detail - South	Division	

Inspector's Comments: etc.)	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
Required Action: None.	
Corrective Action Plan/T	îmeline

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 11/30/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE 11/19/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
Concur Do not concur	4. g. Durnell Al Chief	1/20/10

#### Memorandum

Date:

December 28, 2009

To:

Protective Services Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

File No.:

025.11844.15601

Subject:

FOURTH QUARTER, 2009, INSPECTION OF COMMAND OVERTIME,

CAPITOL PROTECTION SECTION

Capitol Protection Section (CPS) has completed its fourth quarter inspection of Command Overtime as required by the Office of the Commissioner in a COMMNET message dated January 9, 2009. A review of CPS processes and procedures related to the management of overtime revealed that Section was in general compliance with polices and procedures outlined in the Administrative Procedures Manual (HPM 11.1), CHP 415 User's Manual (HPM 40.71), Employee Assistance Programs Manual (HPM 10.5), and the Personnel Transactions Manual (HPM 10.3).

This inspection revealed only one deficiency in program management. The deficiency involved the failure of some employees to document "RDO" in the notes section of the CHP 415, Daily Field Record, when overtime was worked on a regular day off. Out of a random sampling of CHP 415's claiming overtime worked on a regular day off, only 20 percent of the sample indicated "RDO" in the notes section.

In response to this noted deficiency, Section has taken immediate steps to ensure compliance with departmental policy. Further, in addition to the corrective actions taken, Section will perform quarterly audits to ensure compliance with this and other overtime policies.

If there are any questions regarding the results of this inspection, please feel free to contact me or Sergeant David Kessler at (916) 322-3337.

Ř. P. GHIGLIERI, Captain,

Commander

Attachments

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Overtime

Command: Capitol Protection Section	Division: Protective Services Division	Number: 025
Evaluated by:	Date:	
Sergeant D. Kessler, ID	12/21/2009	
Assisted by:	Date:	
Lieutenant A. Stallman,	ID 12150	12/21/2009

applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION UT/1250 Division Level □ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level FOR KESSLEN ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Date: Follow-up Required: Commander's Signature: 12/28/2009 Follow-up Inspection X Yes No For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6, HPM 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, Chapter 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28 are currently being followed. Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable Remarks: overtime being held responsible for paying a X Yes ☐ No □ N/A minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail? 2. Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated Remarks: to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation X Yes □ No  $\square$  N/A notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation? 3. Are reimbursable special project codes being used Remarks: for all overtime associated with reimbursable special ✓ Yes □No □ N/A projects? 4. Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel Remarks: overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of ✓ Yes ☐ No □ N/A Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects? 5. Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable Remarks: overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other □ No □ N/A than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during their regular work shift time? Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the Remarks: A sampling of overtime CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked on ☐ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A 415's revealed that "RDO" was a regular day off? indicated on approximately 20% of 415's submitted on an RDO.

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy,

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

	Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance - Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant when overtime is associated for civil court?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
8.	Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	<ul> <li>Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: To this date, Section has not utilized Peer Support Services.
	Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13.	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 1 of 2

	ommand: Capitol rotection Section	Division: Protective Services Division	Chapter: #6 Command Overtime	
Inspected by: Sergeant D. Kessler, ID 15601 Evaluated by Lieutenant A. Stallman, ID 12150			Date: 12/21/2009	

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection shall be routed to and its due date. This document improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective	tion number. Under "Forward to:" enter t nent shall be utilized to document innova	ry, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter the next level of command where the document tive practices, suggestions for statewide may be used if additional space is required.			
TYPE OF INSPECTION  Division Level Command Level  Executive Office Level	Total hours expended on the inspection: 10	<ul><li>☑ Corrective Action Plan Included</li><li>☐ Attachments Included</li></ul>			
Servi	ard to: Protective ces Division  Date: 12/28/2009				
Chapter Inspection: 6 Inspector's Comments Regarding None.					
None.  Inspector's Findings:	de Improvement:				
Sergeant D. Kessler, ID 15601, of Capitol Protection Section's (CPS) conducted an inspection of the Section's processes and procedures for managing overtime usage on Monday, December 4, 2009. The inspection revealed substantial compliance with policy requirements involving overtime usage and reporting. A minor discrepancy in required procedures was noted involving the indication of "RDO" in the notes section of the CHP 415 when claiming overtime hours on a regular day off (RDO).  Item # 6: A random sampling of CHP 415s claiming overtime hours on an RDO's was inspected. The inspection revealed that only twenty percent of the CHP 415s inspected indicated "RDO" in the notes section when overtime was earned on a regular day off.					
Commander's Response: ⊠ Conc	ur or	Concur shall document basis for response)			
The discrepancy was noted and will Action Plan/Timeline Section of this	be corrected within the time freport.	ames indicated in the Corrective			

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: Capitol	Division: Protective	Chapter: #6
Protection Section	Services Division	Command Overtime
Inspected by: Sergeant Evaluated by Lieutenant	Date: 12/21/2009	

Inspector's Comments: etc.)	Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,
Mana	

None.

Required Action	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	

Effective immediately, all personnel shall be briefed and reminded of the requirement to indicate "RDO" in the notes section of their CHP 415s when working overtime on a regular day off. They will be held accountable for proper overtime recording. CHP 415s not having this notation when required, shall be returned for correction. Personnel in charge of reviewing CHP 415s shall be briefed of this requirement and will ensure policy requirements for CHP 415 documentation are strictly followed.

Projected Completion Date: Immediate Action

Compliance Report: March 31, 2010



Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/28/2009
	FOIL VOSSOUT	DATE 12/28/2009
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
Concur Do not concur	PR Quenell A/Chuf	1/20/10

#### Memorandum

Date:

December 28, 2009

To:

Protective Services Division

From:

DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

File No.:

025.11844.15601

Subject:

FOURTH QUARTER, 2009, INSPECTION OF COMMAND GRANT

MANAGEMENT, CAPITOL PROTECTION SECTION

Capitol Protection Section (CPS) recently completed its fourth quarter inspection of Command Grant Management as required by the Office of the Commissioner in a COMMNET message dated January 9, 2009. A review of CPS procedures related to Command Grant Management revealed Section was in compliance with polices and procedures outlined in General Order 40.6, Departmental Grants Program.

Due to CPS' unique location in downtown Sacramento and its primary mission of providing security to the State Capitol, state property, and state employees, Section does not have primary traffic safety responsibility in this geographical area. Traffic safety is a secondary mission of CPS and is conducted in an ancillary role or when resources exist. As a result, Section does not normally apply for traffic safety grant funds.

However, periodically grant funds designated for traffic safety are supplemented to CPS from other Areas or from Headquarters, Valley Division, Research and Planning, or Special Projects Section. When allocated, these funds are dedicated to the purpose intended and reporting procedures strictly followed. Because of its limited role in traffic enforcement and the fact CPS does not have direct responsibility over grant programs originating from the Office of Traffic Safety; many parts of this inspection are not applicable to this Section.

If you have any questions regarding the results of this inspection, please feel free to contact me or Sergeant David Kessler at (916) 322-3337.

R. P. GHIGLIERI, Captain,

Commander

Attachments

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 1 of 2

Command: Capitol	Division: Protective	Chapter: #6				
Protection Section	Services Division	Grant Management				
Inspected by: Sergean Reviewed by: Lieutena	Date: 12/21/2009					

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required.					
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection: 12		☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included	
Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes ⊠ No	Servic	vard to: Protective rices Division  Date: 12/28/2009			
Chapter Inspection: 6  Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:					
None.					
Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement:					
None.					
Inspector's Findings:					

Sergeant D. Kessler, ID 15601, of Capitol Protection Section (CPS) inspected Capitol Protection Section's Grant Management Program on Monday, December 8, 2009. Due to its unique location in downtown Sacramento and its primary mission of providing security to the State Capitol, state property and state employees, CPS does not have primary traffic safety responsibility in this geographical area. Traffic safety is a secondary mission of CPS, which is conducted in an ancillary role or when resources exist. As a result of this limited traffic enforcement application, CPS does not normally apply for or directly manage traffic safety grant funds. When funding is allocated, it is in the context of support for larger grant programs managed by other Areas or at the direction of Headquarters, Valley Division, Research and Planning, or Special Projects Section. Examples of specific funds supplemented to CPS from other Sections include programs dedicated to child safety restraint system installation, speed enforcement, and the reduction of driving under the influence violations. When grant funds are provided, CPS dedicates these funds exclusively for the programs intended and ensures that proper management and reporting procedures are followed. Because CPS does not directly apply for or oversee the management of grant funded programs, many parts of this chapter inspection were not applicable to CPS.

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command: Capitol Division: Protective Services Division		Chapter: #6 Grant Management
Inspected by: Sergean Reviewed by: Lieutenar	Date: 12/21/2009	

Commander's Response: ⊠ Concur or [	☐ Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall docun	nent basis for response)
Command concurs with the investigator's	findings.	
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non cetc.)	concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised	l, findings unchanged,
Not Applicable.		
, pp. 100.000		
Required Action		
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline		
Not Applicable.		
у при		
Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	Abril (ca)	12/28/2009
(133	MSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/28/2009
Dovious disquesed this are set with	I Stell For KESSLER	A.A. 43 & O.A. 44 & O.A. 4
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	RÉVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
☐ Do not concur	P.R. Dunell A/Chal	1/20/10

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Capitol Division: Protective Services Division		Number: 025
Evaluated by:	Date:	
Sergeant D. Kessler, ID	12/21/2009	
Reviewed by:	Date:	
Lieutenant A. Stallman,	12/21/2009	

discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command Level ·T/12150 ☐ Executive Office Level For ILESSLEN ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Follow-up Required: Commander's Signature: Date: 12/28/2009 Follow-up Inspection ⊠ No Yes For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted ☐ Yes ⊠ N/A □ No Remarks: CPS has no a grant application to a funding agency other than the jurisdictional responsibilities Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus regarding traffic safety. on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? 2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ☐ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: CPS has no for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and jurisdictional responsibilities engineering studies, system development or program regarding traffic safety. implementations? 3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs T Yes □ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: Primary mission is identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety state security. NHTSA's Administration? priority programs do not apply to this Section. 4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for □ N/A ⊠ Yes □ No Remarks: non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: CPS' unique Unit (GMU)? responsibilities do not require traffic safety grants. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: CPS' is not preparing concept paper budgets? required to prepare concept paper budgets or grants.

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: CPS' unique responsibilities do not require OTS grants to perform its primary mission of State security.
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: CPS does not directly manage OTS grants.
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: CPS' unique responsibilities do not require Section to solicit funds for traffic safety.
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: CPS' unique responsibilities do not require Section to manage grant funds for traffic safety.
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: All usage of grant hours provided to Section are reported to the Area or Office of Primary Interest (OPI) charged with management of grant funds.
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Command follows reporting procedures provided by Areas or OPI's with grant management jurisdiction.
14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Due to the unique mission of CPS, no traffic safety invoices are produced.
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: CPS does not purchase or utilize equipment purchased with OTS grant funds.
Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: CPS has not received any grant funded equipment to this date.

## COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

17	<ul> <li>Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?</li> <li>This would include any of the following:         <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.</li> <li>Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Requirement does not apply to Section/Area Command level.
	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Requirement does not apply to Section/Area Command level.
	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Does not apply to Section/Area Command level.
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Command does not have a Motor Carrier unit.
	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: CPS has applied for one Homeland Security Grant utilizing appropriate application procedures.
Manag	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants ement Unit				
	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GML2	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks: